

SENATE RECORD VOTE ANALYSIS

106th Congress
1st Session

Vote No. 80

March 25, 1999, 9:43 p.m.
Page S-3428 Temp. Record

BUDGET RESOLUTION/Tax Relief Delay

SUBJECT: Senate Concurrent Budget Resolution for fiscal years 2000-2009 . . . S.Con. Res. 20. Kerry motion to waive the Budget Act for the consideration of the Kerry amendment No. 190.

ACTION: MOTION REJECTED, 45-54

SYNOPSIS: As reported, S.Con. Res. 20, the Senate Concurrent Budget Resolution for fiscal years 2000-2009: will cut the debt held by the public (money that the Federal Government owes to creditors other than itself) in half over 10 years; will fully fund Medicare (all of the President's proposed \$9 billion in Medicare cuts were rejected; as a result, this budget will allow \$20.4 billion more in Medicare spending over the next 10 years); will save the entire \$1.8 trillion in Social Security surpluses over the next 10 years for Social Security; will provide for \$778 billion in net tax relief over the next 10 years (in contrast, the President's budget would increase the tax burden by \$96 billion net over 10 years), and will adhere to the spending restraints (discretionary spending caps and pay-go provisions) of the bipartisan budget agreement as enacted in the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 and the Taxpayer Reform Act of 1997 (the President's proposed budget, in contrast, would dramatically increase spending in violation of that bipartisan agreement, and would result in \$2.2 trillion more in total Federal debt at the end of 10 years than proposed in this Senate budget).

The Kerry amendment would provide that the effective date of any of the tax relief provided pursuant to this resolution would be delayed for 1 year in any year that the Congressional Budget Office determined that giving that tax relief would result in on-budget deficit spending in the years scored under this resolution.

After debate, Senator Domenici raised a point of order that the amendment violated section 305(b)(2) (the germaneness requirement) of the Budget Act. Senator Kerry then moved to waive the Budget Act for the consideration of the amendment. Generally, those favoring the motion to waive opposed the amendment; those opposing the motion to waive favored the amendment.

NOTE: A three-fifths majority (60) vote is required to waive the Budget Act. After the failure of the motion to waive, the point of order was upheld and the amendment thus fell.

(See other side)

YEAS (45)		NAYS (54)		NOT VOTING (1)	
Republicans (0 or 0%)	Democrats (45 or 100%)	Republicans (54 or 100%)	Democrats (0 or 0%)	Republicans (1)	Democrats (0)
Akaka	Kennedy	Abraham	Helms	McCain ²	
Baucus	Kerrey	Allard	Hutchinson		
Bayh	Kerry	Ashcroft	Hutchison	EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE: 1—Official Business 2—Necessarily Absent 3—Illness 4—Other SYMBOLS: AY—Announced Yea AN—Announced Nay PY—Paired Yea PN—Paired Nay	
Biden	Kohl	Bennett	Inhofe		
Bingaman	Landrieu	Bond	Jeffords		
Boxer	Lautenberg	Brownback	Kyl		
Breaux	Leahy	Bunning	Lott		
Bryan	Levin	Burns	Lugar		
Byrd	Lieberman	Campbell	Mack		
Cleland	Lincoln	Chafee	McConnell		
Conrad	Mikulski	Cochran	Murkowski		
Daschle	Moynihan	Collins	Nickles		
Dodd	Murray	Coverdell	Roberts		
Dorgan	Reed	Craig	Roth		
Durbin	Reid	Crapo	Santorum		
Edwards	Robb	DeWine	Sessions		
Feingold	Rockefeller	Domenici	Shelby		
Feinstein	Sarbanes	Enzi	Smith, Bob		
Graham	Schumer	Fitzgerald	Smith, Gordon		
Harkin	Torricelli	Frist	Snowe		
Hollings	Wellstone	Gorton	Specter		
Inouye	Wyden	Gramm	Stevens		
Johnson		Grams	Thomas		
		Grassley	Thompson		
		Gregg	Thurmond		
		Hagel	Voinovich		
		Hatch	Warner		

Those favoring the motion to waive contended:

This amendment would not deny any tax relief. It would only delay relief if giving it would result in an on-budget deficit. We favor giving targeted tax relief, but we do not favor it at the expense of again running on-budget deficits. We urge the adoption of this fiscally responsible amendment.

Those opposing the motion to waive contended:

The first point that must be made is we do not have authority in a budget resolution to do what this amendment suggests. We can tell the Finance Committee to propose tax cuts, but we cannot tell it to propose conditional tax cuts based on estimates of the on-budget surplus. A more important point, though, is that we oppose the idea of passing taxes that turn on or off depending on budget estimates. If we enact tax relief, people should understand that they are going to get it. The third strike against this amendment is that it is not balanced--it would only apply to tax relief, not to the additional on-budget spending that will be permitted by this resolution. We appreciate our colleagues' concern for preserving the on-budget surplus, but this amendment is not acceptable.